

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration. Claims 26-31 are pending in this application, with claim 26 being an independent claim. No new matter has been added.

Information Disclosure Statement

The Examiner has indicated that the Information Disclosure Statement of June 6, 2005 (which was mailed on June 1, 2005) fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each publication or that portion which caused it to be listed. The Examiner states that there are items on the list that are missing and that legible copies are required.

Although Applicant has previously provided copies of the subject references to the USPTO, Applicant is herewith providing new copies of the references for the Examiner's consideration at the Examiner's request. Also provided is a clean copy of the previously submitted Form PTO-1449 for the Examiner to initial and include with the next communication to the Applicant.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner has indicated that claims 27, 29 and 30 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant maintains that the claims objected to by the Examiner do not require amendment and are allowable based on the arguments presented below in response to the Examiner's rejection of the claims from which claims 27, 29 and 30 depend.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

The Examiner has rejected claims 26, 28 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by C. Wayne Smith, Archaeological preservation research laboratory report 11, 1998 (hereinafter "Smith"). The Examiner has argued that Smith discloses the methods of claim 26, 28 and 31.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. Smith describes a spectrographic analysis of off-gasses from waterlogged archaeological wood samples and not a method for compositional analysis of chemical units of a sample polymer as claimed by Applicant. In order for a reference to be

anticipatory, the reference must teach all of the limitations of the claim(s) it anticipates and must also be enabling. Applicant maintains that Smith does not provide all of the limitations of the rejected claims. In addition, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be enabled by the teachings of Smith to practice the methods of Applicant's claims.

The Examiner has not demonstrated how Smith provides even the general concept of analyzing chemical units of a sample polymer. Smith analyzes the levels of various discrete off-gasses from waterlogged wood samples. This is not an analysis of the composition of chemical units of a polymer. Additionally, Smith does not provide the steps of applying an experimental constraint to a sample polymer, detecting a property of the modified sample polymer or comparing the modified sample polymer to a reference database of polymers. Smith also does not provide that the polymers of the reference database have been subjected to the same experimental constraint as the sample polymer or that the comparison provides a compositional analysis of the sample polymer. Table 2, which the Examiner cites in the rejection, is a table providing the average ion abundance of the various off-gasses detected and does not represent the detection of a property of the modified sample polymer, the degradation of the polymer into individual chemical units, an analysis revealing the number and type of units within the polymer, or a reference database as asserted by the Examiner.

Furthermore, the Examiner has not demonstrated how Smith enables the methods of the rejected claims. Applicant maintains that Smith cannot enable that which is not described in its teachings.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the telephone number listed below if this communication does not place the case in condition for allowance.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 23/2825.

Respectfully submitted,



Janice A. Vatland, Ph.D., Reg. No. 52,318
WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.
Federal Reserve Plaza
600 Atlantic Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2206
(617) 646-8000

Date: January 23, 2006
x1/23/06x